OE FORM 6000, 2/69

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO.				IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
CH ACC. NO.	P.A.	PUBL. DATE	ISSUE	ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☐
AA 000 635		Nov 70	RIEMAR71	LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☒ II ☐ III ☐

ED 043 800

AUTHOR
Patterson, Lewis D.

TITLE
Consortia in American Higher Education.

SOURCE CODE	INSTITUTION (SOURCE)
EEB01751	
SP. AG. CODE	SPONSORING AGENCY

EDRS PRICE	CONTRACT NO.	GRANT NO.
0.25;1.25		

REPORT NO.	BUREAU NO.
R-7	

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE
23p.

DESCRIPTORS
*Higher Education; *Consortia; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Annotated Bibliographies; *Cooperative Programs

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT
This report includes an essay discussing the rationale behind the promotion and growth of consortia and some of the practical problems of interinstitutional cooperation, and an annotated bibliography of 52 selected references on the topic. Administration, funding, founding purposes, common arrangements, and development processes are discussed with an emphasis on voluntary interinstitutional agreements. (JS)

GPO 870-390

ED 043 800

Consortia in American Higher Education

REPORT 7

AA 000 635

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON HIGHER EDUCATION • The George Washington University, One Dupont Circle, Suite 630, Washington, D.C. 20036 • November

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CONSORTIA IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Lewis D. Patterson

AA000 635

Report 7

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
The George Washington University
1 Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036
November 1970

FOREWORD

Lewis D. Patterson, Director of Program Development at the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, has done much on the local and national levels to bring together information on and individuals involved with consortium development. This report includes an essay discussing the rationale behind the promotion and growth of consortia and some of the practical problems of interinstitutional cooperation, and an annotated bibliography of 52 selected references on the topic.

The seventh in a series of reports on various aspects of higher education, this paper represents one of several kinds of Clearinghouse publications. Others include short reviews, bibliographies and compendia based on recent significant documents found both in and outside the ERIC collection. In addition, the current research literature of higher education is abstracted and indexed for publication in the U.S. Office of Education's monthly volume, *Research in Education*. Readers who wish to order ERIC documents cited in the bibliography should write to the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014. When ordering, please specify the ERIC document (ED) number. Payment for microfiche (MF) or hard/photo copies (HC) must accompany orders of less than $5.00.

Carl J. Lange, *Director*
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
November 1970

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

I. BACKGROUND

The wide scale establishment of consortia by large numbers of colleges and universities is a significant movement in American higher education today. The growth of interinstitutional cooperation reflects the increasing interdependence of man and his institutions, restlessness on campus and in society, scientific and technological advances, and financial and other pressures; and it testifies to the belief that survival and viability will be found through group affiliation. Raymond Moore (1968) defined a consortium as:

> an arrangement whereby two or more institutions–at least one of which is an institution of higher education–agree to pursue between, or among, them a program for strengthening academic programs, improving administration, or providing for other special needs.

There is every indication that such arrangements in the academic world are becoming more numerous and more complex. This paper will focus specifically on the movement toward *voluntary* academic cooperative arrangements.

The current wave of interinstitutional cooperation runs contrary to the traditional concepts of individuality and independence deeply embedded in the history of American higher education. Some labor to maintain unconditional institutional autonomy and prophesy doom when their efforts "to protect institutional freedom and integrity" are unsuccessful. Regardless of the merits of their arguments, both private and public institutions of higher education can no longer be accorded the luxuries of privileged sanctuaries set apart from the larger environment. When engulfed by great forces, institutions have historically either altered their nature in responding to demands for change or perished.

The concept of institutional independence is so deeply embedded in academic tradition that educators discovering the phenomenon of interinstitutional cooperation for the first time will frequently express great optimism about its potential in the belief that the concept is unique and innovative. This is not the case. The history of interinstitutional cooperation may be traced to Oxford and Cambridge or even earlier, depending on one's definition of the terminology.

> When University College was founded in England in 1249, it is likely that few suspected this was to be but the first of thirty-one colleges which would comprise Oxford University some 700 years later. Laboratories, libraries and various services provided by the University have allowed the colleges to develop autonomously, thus offering to the student the best of both worlds: the advantages of size and smallness, functional interdependence, and corporate independence (McCoy, 1968).

Edgar Sagan (1969) cites numerous instances of British, European, and Asian interinstitutional cooperation of various sorts during the 19th and 20th centuries in his dissertation.

In the United States, the first known formal voluntary association of institutions joined together for academic purposes was The Claremont Colleges founded in 1925 (See Clary, 1970). Four years later, the Atlanta University Center was created. Both of these interinstitutional arrangements continue to operate as viable consortia. The decades of the 30s and 40s witnessed the establishment of numerous limited voluntary and statutory agreements among institutions, but it was not until the late 50s and throughout the 60s that a substantial number of voluntary multi-purpose consortia began emerging. These voluntary interinstitutional organizations or corporate arrangements–termed consortia with increasing frequency–

> . . . were unthinkable in earlier years of religious and secular drives for fiercely independent colleges and universities. Indeed, we have entered a reverse historical phase which seems to embrace interinstitutional coordination and cooperation as a necessary step for completeness (Johnson, 1967).

To illustrate further the newness of "consortiumism," the founding dates of the 51 consortia listed in the *Directory of Academic Cooperative Arrangements* are:

1925-48	*1953-58*	*1961-64*	*1965-70*
4	5	10	32

Logan Wilson (1964) considers the growth of interinstitutional cooperation to be, perhaps, the basic emerging pattern of future higher education. "We no longer have any option between disjointed laissez-faire enterprise on the one hand, and planned, integrated activity on the other."

Growth and interdependence

In American higher education today, according to the 1969-70 *Education Directory*, there are 2551 collegiate institutions varying in size and nature from mini-colleges to maxi-universities. Despite the great number and variety of colleges and universities, the proliferation of autonomous institutions continues–a phenomenon presently exempli-

fied by the rapidly growing number of public community and junior colleges. Concurrently, an appreciable qualitative impact on higher education is being produced by other forces in our society:

1. The emergence of new social, scientific, and technical needs which result in changes in curriculum, facilities, and personnel.
2. Demands for specialization, research, and job-oriented education which require cooperation of a complex nature beyond institutional boundaries.
3. The compulsion to innovate, experiment, apply modern technology, serve society more directly, and effect social, political, and economic change.
4. Mounting costs required to support institutions and increasing competition for public and private funds, resulting in financial uncertainty.

The net result is that every aspect of higher education is being challenged. Interinstitutional cooperation is one compensatory development believed by some to have promise of serving as a balance to these forces of change and of rendering some order to institutional operations. Current educational literature documents the growth occurring both in the further development of the existing cooperative arrangements and organizations and in the founding of new ones.

> Cooperation among institutions of higher education . . . within the past few years has grown especially fast. A generation ago, relatively few colleges and universities were cooperating. The past five years (1963-68), however, have seen a rapid increase in the number participating in one or another form of cooperation. Moreover, continued growth in the number of formal cooperative arrangements can be expected for the simple reason that success breeds success (Moore, 1968).

The variety of arrangements exemplifying interinstitutional cooperation can be illustrated by the following oversimplified schematic breakdown by major types.

Involuntary or Statutory

1. State, County and District Systems of Institutions
2. Interstate Compacts
3. Reciprocal Arrangements

Voluntary or Non-Statutory

1. Fund Raising Associations
2. Lobbying Organizations
3. Academic Purpose Associations and Arrangements

Admittedly, this schema is vulnerable to additional refinement or restructuring–i.e., each of the six subdivisons can be further delineated and different dichotomies can be established on the basis of geography, control, etc. Too, the diversity in types of cooperative arrangements, the complexity of their structures and operations, and the overlapping of functions and membership do not lend to exclusive-inclusive categorization. Because each cooperative arrangement appears to have some unique characteristics, a complete graphic presentation probably would require a listing of each arrangement.

It is beyond the scope of this paper, which focuses primarily upon a selected subdivision of the voluntary academic cooperative arrangements, to dwell in detail upon other types of interinstitutional arrangements. However, some general statements are in order, for voluntary and involuntary cooperative arrangements share common features and can mutually benefit from communication and association.

The trend toward the strengthening of coordinating powers of statewide systems of public institutions has positive implications for cooperative arrangements involving private institutions. Berdahl reports (1970) there were 33 states in 1939 without an agency or board for statewide formal coordination in higher education in contrast to two states in 1969. If it is deemed that public institutions, which enjoy a tax-supported base, should cooperate for financial and other reasons, private institutions will find it increasingly difficult to resist a parallel development. Private institutions should not, however, view interinstitutional cooperation simply as a defensive reaction because voluntary arrangements offer at least five definite advantages over state legislated systems. They can: (1) be more flexible, imaginative, creative, and experimental; (2) cut across state and other political boundaries without seeking governmental sanction; (3) include public institutions as well as private and encourage pluralism within a single system; (4) acquire some of the advantages of largeness and retain advantages of smallness; and (5) cultivate a healthier psychological atmosphere of grass-roots decision making and participation based on need and desire as opposed to hierarchically ordered participation and cooperation.

One major disadvantage, in comparison with statutory systems, is the absence of an assured base of financial support. A second condition, which may or may not be viewed as a disadvantage, is the absence of line authority for moving quickly on an issue when there is not a strong consensus.

Refining the concept

The first step in delimiting the universe of consortia under consideration is to exclude the statutory or non-voluntary arrangements such as the three regional interstate compacts and the legislated statewide systems. The second step is to categorize all voluntary arrangements according to three major purposes and to exclude those whose sole purpose is fund raising or lobbying.

Before identifying the specific type of organization to be reviewed, some of the related types of organizations *not* under consideration should be noted: national associations of institutions such as the American Council on Education and Association of American Colleges; national associations of individuals such as American Association of Higher Education and American Association of University Professors; educational testing agencies such as American College

Testing and College Entrance Examination Board; National Commission for Accrediting and regional accrediting agencies; EDUCOM; the ERIC system; regional educational laboratories; cooperative research development associations; athletic conferences; and reciprocal arrangements.

Moore (1968) identified 1017 existing "consortia," involving more than 1500 institutions. Included in his listing as consortia were: 637 bilateral arrangements, 596 consortia without a separate budget, and an undisclosed number of single purpose agreements–e.g., regarding the reciprocal exchange of students or joint use of libraries. The extreme variation in the kinds of cooperative arrangements and in the level of cooperation represented in this report makes it unmanageable for any practical use except as an informational resource.

Directors of some of the more developed consortia have been supportive of the author's efforts to identify and develop commonalities among themselves. The Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education (KCRCHE) undertook an active role in this mutual adventure in June 1967 with a letter to the directors of 16 consortia that requested an exchange of information. Enthusiastic responses triggered a series of events which have culminated in: eight national meetings, between 1967 and 1970, of consortia staff and interested personnel from the academic and lay sectors; formation of two consortia committees to speak to interinstitutional program needs at the national level; a national foundations-consortia seminar; the voluntary performance of an informal consortia information-center role by KCRCHE; and development and publication of three widely distributed publications. The first is *The Acquainter*, An International Newsletter for Academic Consortia[1], which is distributed regularly to 1650 subscribers. The second includes two questionnaire studies of consortia (Patterson 1968a; 1968b). The third is the *Directory of Academic Cooperative Arrangements in Higher Education*, now in its fourth Edition, which is distributed on request to 4600 individuals and organizations. It lists two Canadian and 59 American consortia, which have been identified over a three-year period as being cooperative arrangements which meet the following criteria. Each consortium: (1) is a voluntary formal organization, (2) has three or more member institutions, (3) implements multi-academic programs, (4) employs at least one full-time professional to administer consortium programs, and (5) has a required annual contribution or other tangible evidence of long-term commitment of member institutions.

Names of the 61 consortia listed in the *Directory* are contained in Appendix A. The five criteria were not intended to serve as *the* definition of consortia nor has the *Directory* listing sought to establish an exclusive group. Similarly, *The Acquainter* newsletter for consortia, the academic consortia seminars, and other communication-association activities have encouraged open-ended discussion with *all* interested parties.

The mercurial nature and increasing number of consortia require an updating of the *Directory* every 6 to 12 months to keep it reasonably accurate. The Fourth Edition, to be published in November 1970, will include a minimum of 12 new consortia. This increase in eight months is typical of the growth pattern for the past four years, and indications are that the number of consortia will continue to increase indefinitely.

II. DEVELOPING A CONSORTIUM

Two or more institutions considering the formation of a consortium should determine their mutual needs and goals as a collective base from which the actual cooperative structure and programs might flow. The heterogeneity and uniqueness of existing operational consortia cannot be emphasized too much. Consortia directors agree there is not and should not be *a* model consortium for others to emulate, although planners can benefit from acquaintance with the successes and failures of other interinstitutional arrangements.

Courtship and marriage

The fact that certain external funding is more readily available to cooperative arrangements may stimulate a group of institutions, not well known to each other, to submit a proposed program for extensive interinstitutional cooperation. A funding agency should seriously consider whether the purposes of higher education will be well served when several institutions hastily organize for the creation of a cooperative program, for the rigidity of and slow nature of change in higher education institutions do not suggest that shot-gun weddings will be long lasting or promising. To award a grant, then, of several hundred thousand dollars to a group of competitive institutions having no history of association or cooperation is extremely risky. If a group of institutions truly are to live with each other, "courting" time is a prerequisite for them to become thoroughly acquainted. And, the courting should start where most power is vested–with institutional presidents. If presidential cooperation does not exist, it is likely that little else will follow. After presidents have come to know each other personally and to understand their institutional missions within a cooperative framework, their confidence in and support of the consortium will grow. This confidence will open the door for encouraging participation of and delegating responsibility to other institutional personnel–a necessary step since, as Grupe noted (in Burnett, 1969), cooperation between presidents alone is presidential cooperation, not interinstitutional cooperation.

Unless the cooperative arrangement is special or single purpose, its development generally will entail an expansion of institutional involvement along certain lines. Academic deans and vice-presidential administrators are likely to become involved early. Following the "structuring" of cooperation by the administrators, opportunities for in-

volvement usually are extended next to departmental chairmen and faculty. This pattern of development–progressive stages of involvement by administrators, faculty, students and community–has been followed by several of the more advanced multi-purpose academic consortia, but not always as a result of careful planning.

Conditioned by their responsibilities, administrators are not notorious for generating ideas, innovating, experimenting, and developing new programs. Too, their staggering responsibilities limit their time available for sustained cooperative efforts. Thus, the process of developing inter-institutional confidence should be broadly based. Faculty, when accorded an opportunity to cooperate, may appear less conservative and more resourceful in their suggestions and enthusiasm for cooperative programs. Students, in turn, can make the faculty look conservative by comparison. With student power now a major concern, they might become the driving force behind the consortium's development, should they capture a glimpse of the potential strength they might acquire through a cooperative arrangement.

So far, student involvement has been rather limited. More often, students are the "focus" of cooperation in that programs are established to provide them with cooperative off-campus centers, overseas study programs, cross-campus registration opportunities, etc. Interinstitutional programs planned and developed by students are increasing, but they still involve a relatively small number of students. It is reasonable to anticipate, though, that new trails will be blazed over this unexplored frontier.

Community involvement has also been only occasional. A few consortia are experimenting with representation from welfare and governmental agencies, school districts, and business schools or enterprises. Further off-campus involvement will come slowly because of: (1) the reluctance of institutions to invite external forces to participate in the formulation of educational programs and policy, and (2) the community's narrower concern for education directed to immediate and practical relevance. In keeping with the notion that increasing interdependence will continue to evolve, greater community involvement is inevitable.

The development of a consortium can also be measured by the number of institutions a particular cooperative program is successfully serving. Until a cooperative arrangement has achieved some success, programs should be endorsed by and equally beneficial to all member institutions. After several programs have become operational, the corporate board may authorize additional new programs that will interest or serve a majority but not all of the member institutions. A yet more advanced stage of maturity is reached when programs are developed which benefit a minority of the institutions or even only one or two members. Such liberalization, however, probably should not occur until the consortium has a relatively large number of successful cooperative programs under way.

Detailed reporting of the stages other consortia have experienced in their formation and development are referred to in three dissertation studies completed in 1969 and annotated in this paper (Grupe, Lancaster, and Sagan).

College presidents frequently express the fear that the central organizations of highly developed consortia may acquire positions of power and status greater than that of the individual member institutions, and thus may begin to expect the institutions to serve the central organization instead of vice versa. Too, presidents fear that highly developed consortium might infringe upon the individuality of member institutions. Whether there is a real basis for these fears has not been tested because no consortium has yet attained such status. The reservations of the more cautious might, however, be challenged on several grounds:

1. Voluntary participation forecloses required conformity.
2. Proclaimed institutional individuality is frequently more rhetorical than real.
3. Conformity in certain procedures does not necessarily require conformity in all matters.
4. Cooperative planning and development can be used to provide greater, not less, freedom and opportunity for diversity, experimentation, and pilot programs.
5. The relinquishing of certain prerogatives for the good of a larger cause can result in greater individual institutional opportunities.
6. Cooperation can provide greater institutional stability.
7. Cooperation can diminish the detrimental effect of specific program failures.

Administration

Textbooks on administration in higher education lack any treatment of consortium administration. Neither have the curricula of schools of education offered courses specifically geared to the organization and administration of cooperative educational enterprises. The need to correct these deficiencies will be heightened in the next five years as the number and scope of cooperative arrangements increase and as administrative leadership in interinstitutional cooperation becomes recognized as a profession in its own right.

Administrators for new consortia are currently being drawn primarily from the college and university administration labor market. While an understanding of and experience in institutional administration are important, the kind of leadership needed for consortia calls for "authority" to be based on the power of suggestion and persuasion–quite different from the traditional hierarchial leadership. Perhaps the major difference could be considered as attitudinal. Persons experienced in staff positions, as opposed to line positions, may be more readily adaptive to consortium administration. Ideally, the background of a consortium director would include broadly based training and experience and evidence of interpersonal competence comparable to substantive competence. Re-

sourcefulness and innovativeness would enhance the director's ability to serve effectively in his important roles of change agent and program developer. The annotated bibliography, "New Patterns of Leadership for Tomorrow's Organization," by Warren G. Bennis (1968) further elaborates the new breed of leadership needed for higher education.

There are two schools of thought concerning consortium leadership: (1) that the central office staff should demonstrate professional competence and leadership comparable to or better than that of institutional staff counterparts; and (2) that leadership should come only from the campuses of member institutions, and central office professional personnel, if there are any, should be service agents only. Fortunately, the leadership question is not an either/or one. It is possible and preferable to have mutually supportive central and multi-campus leadership. In fact, the knowledgeable and skilled consortium director will seek campus responsibility at all levels of the institution.

The role of the director is to implement policy, but, should he assume prerogatives that have not been duly accorded, he places himself in a precarious and defenseless posture. Some of his responsibilities are to raise questions, make recommendations, provide staff papers, and offer compromise solutions to his board when policy is being determined. Like the chief administrative officer of any organization, the consortium director has the advantage of a broad perspective from a unique position not available to his constituents. Having that advantage, he should sense an obligation to share his insights and even to make specific recommendations. In short, his leadership can best be identified as having the elements of "cooperative management."

If the institutions in a given consortium have determined that their cooperative programs are to be of a limited nature and deal primarily with peripheral concerns, the calibre of the central office staffing should reflect that decision. With these restraints, the employment of an executive director comparable to his institutional presidents in professional stature and competence would lead inevitably to frustration and conflict. Rather, a second or third echelon administrator, perhaps a secretary, who understands his or her role–that of responding to campus requests and instructions, coordinating the program's implementation, and remaining behind the scene–would be much more appropriate.

Suspicions and funding

One reason for discounting the service agent role as a viable approach to consortium development is that the evidence does not indicate that the institution caught in a life-and-death financial struggle for survival, will systematically and continually invest unilaterally a significant portion of its resources in a program in which other institutions share the benefits. Further, when such a sponsoring institution does vigorously continue an involvement in a cooperative program, it becomes vulnerable to suspicion–whether justifiably or not–by the other participants. The realities of the educational world, which include competition, conflict, and consciousness of survival, make such suspicions plausible.

Another closely related reality of life is the perspective of the funding agency. Philanthropic foundations and governmental agencies must be discriminating in awarding their limited funds. If the purposes of their grants are to bring about change and new program development, they generally will fund first those proposed programs which more nearly assure multi-campus impact.

To carry the point further, if a group of institutions submits a proposal soliciting external support, sophisticated proposal readers will look for a variety of clues to judge the commitment of the requesting institutions. If a proposal for a cooperative program requests, for example, $200,000 and indicates new trails will be blazed but designates only $10,000 per year for the chief administrator, the agency (with good cause) will be dubious of what might be accomplished unless there are very special mitigating circumstances. The commitment to competent leadership is reflected also in the credentials and calibre of the supporting staff. Administrators should note that few, if any, positions in higher education offer a broader and more exciting experience than working for and with several colleges simultaneously. A new consortium wishing to begin slowly and to develop its sophistication in cooperation should consider "developing" a director simultaneously.

The final answer to the leadership question, which can be controversial, should emerge from the context of the prevailing circumstances. Consideration of the desired strength in the central office should provoke additional questions regarding the situation at hand. For example, under what conditions will:

1. the board of directors, usually comprised of institutional presidents, limit its authority to establishing policy, and leave administration to the appropriate staff?
2. presidents, deans, departmental chairmen, faculty and others with "impressive" academic credentials discount an idea on the basis of its source rather than its merits?
3. traditionally autonomous, competitive institutions impart trust in a neutral agency?
4. institutional personnel look upon the central office staff as a vital and essential resource?

Centralization versus decentralization

Tangential to the leadership question is the issue of centralized versus decentralized operations. The member institutions of several consortia have elected to develop a cadre of central office staff to administer their cooperative programs. Other consortia have experimented with the decentralized approach whereby the member institutions divide the responsibility for administering major coopera-

tive programs. And, varying combinations of both approaches to cooperation have been implemented by others.

Before considering the merits of either of these approaches, attention should be drawn to an erroneous notion held far too frequently among institutional administrators regarding decentralized operations. This notion is that little or no additional operational costs are required for cooperative programming. However, if a particular program requires little or no additional resources, the significance and/or peripheral nature of that program is questionable. To state the point bluntly, interinstitutional programs are not developed and administered without an investment of manpower, money, and other resources whether they are centralized or decentralized. This is recognized in Title III (Higher Education Act, 1965) by the allowance of 15% for indirect (overhead) costs.

Proponents of centralized administration of cooperative programs argue that:

1. The sensitivity and complexity of interinstitutional cooperation merit professional administrative leadership. Staff who devote full time to developing this expertise will administer programs more efficiently and effectively than institutional administrators who are delegated numerous responsibilities that are often unrelated to their normal duties.
2. Cooperative programs that provide specialized personnel and/or resources will be utilized more fully by all of the participating institutions if lodged with a "neutral" agency in a central location.
3. When a particular institution's needs and requests exceed the resources available, a centralized staff functioning from a neutral office will more nearly ensure an equitable sharing of the program's offerings.
4. Programs centralized geographically frequently are more effectively and economically administered.
5. Centralized staffing will more likely ensure adequate preparation before and follow-through after an activity.
6. Interinstitutional confidence in new program development may be enhanced and facilitated by a central staff who, again, are more likely to be considered neutral in regard to each participating institution.

The statements above should not be interpreted to mean that decentralized programs administered by a single institution for joint benefit should not be considered. A specific example of this would be a case in which a large public university has a cooperative arrangement with several small private colleges for research purposes. The need for computers, highly specialized expertise, and other expensive resources, which only the university might have, suggests that the larger institution should probably be the cooperative research program sponsor. Returning to the earlier point, though, the university will certainly entail additional expense if the several colleges are truly serviced. Proponents of decentralized operations may argue that:

1. Expertise should be developed on the campuses rather than in a central office.
2. Cooperative programs should relate directly to other programs on the campus rather than be independent–a result of removal to an off-campus location.
3. Decentralized programs take greater advantage of institutional initiatives.
4. Costs for operating cooperative programs are more easily borne on the campuses.

Decentralized cooperation presents fewer problems when the participating institutions are in close geographical proximity–e.g., The Claremont Colleges–than when they are widely dispersed–e.g., the Northwest Association of Private Colleges and Universities. In a cluster arrangement, there may be mutual agreement on certain areas of specialization for each campus. Each college is then responsible for developing the agreed upon areas of specialization. The easy staff movement and student access to the program offerings of the "educational complex" are definite advantages of a cluster of colleges over cooperating colleges geographically separated.

If a cooperative arrangement calls for pursuit of all of its programs on a decentralized basis, it then must consider the apportioning of program assignments in terms of equal responsibility for each participant. If one institution administers considerably more or less cooperative programs than each of the other participating institutions, the potential for strains becomes very real. Too, future growth may be hampered by the improbability of all participating institutions being able to mount a new program simultaneously. Resorting to the other alternative–a staggering of program development–will result in an unevenness which may be workable but certainly poses additional hazards. If a group of institutions considering a consortium arrangement is not certain of the advantages of centralized or decentralized operations, it might consider experimenting with both simultaneously. A number of consortia have successfully developed both kinds of programs.

Purposes

An analysis of the purposes of 51 consortia, as declared in their legal documents, reveals there are four basic principles around which the logic for consorting revolves. They are: (1) to improve the quality of programs; (2) to expand educational opportunities; (3) to save money; and (4) to relate more effectively with the outside community. While the phrasing of declared purposes may vary, these four accommodate, indirectly if not directly, all of the formally declared purposes. Since these goals are highly interrelated, the typical consortium program or activity will serve more than one, and, occasionally all four simultaneously. Library cooperation, for example, can implement programs, expand the availability of resources, result in financial savings, and provide better service to and project a more favorable image in the public sector.

Examples of *improvement in the quality of programs* are: meetings, workshops, conferences, and institutes for students, faculty and administrators; joint utilization of scholars in residence, visiting professors, lecturers and

consultants; and acquisition of resource materials and equipment for shared use such as audio-visual materials. This purpose is regarded as one of the most important, and its attainment is the most difficult to assess. If an instructor changes his teaching style as a result of having participated in an interdisciplinary seminar, who is to judge (1) that the change was an improvement, and, (2) what measure or quantification of improvement occurred. If a group of administrators undertake the development of a systems approach to institutional management, how may the purported improved efficiency be evaluated, and what relationship, if any, does this have for the eventual beneficiary, the student?

Inservice training for the professional growth of institutional personnel (though better received if not labeled as such) is another aspect of quality improvement that is well adapted to the consortium arrangement. The bringing together of a limited number of staff from several institutions provides an opportunity for communication and association unlike that available within a single institution or at national meetings. Inservice training within a single institution, even a large university, has two distinct disadvantages compared to consortium inservice programs: (1) participants in small groups find it difficult to divorce their hierarchial professional relationships and personal feelings from the topic or subject being considered; and (2) a certain element of parochialism exists within a single institution even when there are varying viewpoints. Conversely, national meetings, planned for large numbers, tend to be too far removed from the scene, too abstract in content, and lacking in procedures for follow-through and evaluation.

The consortium arrangement offers meeting opportunities between the two extremes. The professional who has no counterpart on the same campus–e.g., the dean of students–often feels he holds a lonely position because there really is no one else in whom he can confide with trust and who has an appreciation for his position. The consortium setting, where participation is voluntary and there is no authority structure, offers a climate conducive to sharing and intimacy for professional growth.

Examples of *expansion of educational opportunities* include: agreements to cross-campus registration of students; interinstitutional sharing of faculty; and development of urban centers, field stations, and overseas travel and study programs. Smaller institutions with more limited resources, such as private liberal arts colleges with about 1000 students, are finding it increasingly difficult to provide all of the educational opportunities needed by all of their students for today's world. By pooling their students and other resources for special programs, member institutions in a consortium can mount new programs that were not feasible unilaterally because of their limited number of students. Obviously, joint expansion of educational opportunities permits both institutions to save money.

Money savings are accomplished by the joint utilization and purchasing of services, supplies and equipment. All of the examples cited under the first two purposes above also serve this end. Additional specific examples might include the joint provision of all types of insurance for students and staff, computer services and equipment, instructional media software and hardware, and communications systems.

As science and technology continue to move forward, institutions have no choice but to proceed in development along certain lines if they don't wish to become anachronisms. Educational programs simply cannot ignore developments in various media, in the use of computers and in specialized laboratory equipment. Choosing to be laggard in some areas of development carries the risk of losing viability and "dying on the vine." In the long run, too, the question of developing new offerings becomes a matter of when and how, not whether to or not. The matter of "when" also becomes crucial, for an institution that falls too far behind may discover too late the impossibility of ever catching up. If these premises are accepted, the remaining question is "how" can institutions keep up. The answer to that is becoming increasingly difficult for large, prestigious, well endowed institutions and presents a significantly more formidable challenge for smaller institutions with very limited resources. If there is an answer for less fortunate institutions–particularly those in the private sector having no tax base of support–it should be discovered and pursued cooperatively. No one knows how the interlinking will develop in the future, but those institutions that make an earlier beginning will be more likely to succeed.

Modern communication and transportation systems make it possible for geographically isolated institutions to gain access to the world and acquire the missing but necessary ingredients to round out a reasonably "complete" educational program. But, if the systems are modern, it follows that they will be expensive. For smaller institutions, they will be prohibitive unless cooperative systems for sharing in support and benefits are developed. Thus, the economic factor increasingly will become a major compelling force in the development of consortia and other types of cooperative arrangements.

At this point, another consideration must be acknowledged because the sword of consortium economy is double-edged. Institutions contemplating a multi-purpose academic consortium should not anticipate that cooperation will result in smaller operating budgets for member institutions. Experience has shown that the realization of actual dollar savings is usually limited to those programs specifically instigated to attain that end, such as joint purchasing of student insurance, food services, supplies, and the collection of student loans. The majority of consortia programs involve additional efforts and investments on the part of member institutions. One major expense in cooperation is an item already borne by the institutions: the time of personnel. However, expenses for travel, food and

lodging, correspondence, telephone calls, etc.–unless underwritten by external funding–are real additional expenses.

Few consortia programs are totally funded by governmental and philanthropic grants without a commitment from the recipients that there will be matching contributions. And external funding agencies seldom support a continuing program indefinitely. Their money is generally administered as seed funding to stimulate the development of new programs with the anticipation that the cost of the programs will be absorbed by the participating institutions in one to five years.

The funding of cooperative programs is related to the funding of the central office operations. Member institutions should anticipate that each central office staff member will require indirect and overhead costs equal to or greater than that of a staff member at a single institution. Administration of a multi-campus program involves communication, travel, and other operations of a more time-consuming and complex nature than the administration of a program on a single campus. The salary of central office staff may also need to be higher than that of institutional personnel of comparable status because the central office position does not offer the job security of established institutions. In spite of these factors, the financial records of one consortium revealed that administrative costs at member institutions range from 10 to 40% of the total budget compared to an average of 15% for the consortium operations.

Examples of *relating to the community* are: the joint sponsorship of tutorial services for disadvantaged school students; administration of Model Cities' scholarship funds to needy students; cooperation with VISTA in the placement of students; assistance to chambers of commerce, local governments and others in the sponsoring of special events; and joint endorsement of resolutions to the state and federal governments. Consortia have not really explored the potential of cooperating with off-campus public. And until institutions are better able to relate to each other, they will find it awkward to regard this purpose as one of their major concerns. Not only does the need exist, however, but this arena offers a tremendous area for future growth. It is too costly and too difficult for a single institution in a geographical region, such as a metropolitan area, to respond to many of the regional problems and needs. Through a cooperative system, though, it is possible for several institutions to speak with a single voice to the community at large and to undertake effective broad programs.

Common arrangements

The basis for cooperation, as exemplified in various consortia, appears to be limited only by the imagination of the cooperating participants. Bilateral relationships are more numerous than any other single type of cooperation. The number of such relationships is believed to have increased considerably since a United States Office of Education study reported over 500 in 1966. Bilateral relationships most often occur when two institutions of similar size, usually under 1000 students each, are very close to each other geographically. Occasionally, bilateral relationships involving extensive cooperation have led to corporate merger. Because the dynamics involved in the cooperation of two institutions are significantly different from that of the cooperation of several institutions, bilateral arrangements are not considered consortia.

Location within the same geographical area is the most frequent basis for consortium membership of the 51 cooperative arrangements in the *Directory of Academic Cooperative Arrangements in Higher Education*. When this is the case, the institutional membership usually, though not always, includes various types of institutions–public and private, small and large, junior college-senior college-university. Regional clustering may include outlying institutions with an urban nucleus–such as the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education–or may include only urban institutions–such as the Greater Los Angeles Consortium. A quite different approach, in which the common base is homogeneous institutional membership, is illustrated by the Union of Independent Colleges of Art which has as its members six private, independent colleges of art located across the nation. Other common arrangements include the cooperation of: (1) predominantly black institutions, (2) a "big brother" university and surrounding smaller institutions, (3) research or graduate education oriented institutions, (4) large universities, (5) prestigious or developing private liberal arts member colleges, (6) junior colleges, and (7) institutions interested in developing special programs–e.g., international education, library or computer services cooperation. Relatively homogeneous institutions have a larger common base for cooperation. On the other hand, a consortium of heterogeneous institutions contains a broader range of perspectives to be brought to bear upon issues that are jointly considered. It is not uncommon for one institution to participate in two or more cooperative arrangements.

Process of development

The *process* of developing and implementing interinstitutional programs is often as crucial as the realization of program objectives themselves. For instance, institutional personnel responsible for long-range planning generally are aware that the production of a document projecting the growth of an institution over the next five or ten years is not in itself the most difficult task involved in long-range planning. Any one of a number of staff members, could, with access to adequate data, isolate himself and in due time formulate a comprehensive long-range plan. If this person is skillful and familiar with the institution, he may very well project future development with a high degree of accuracy. But, when the involvement of staff, students, and constituents is missing, the more significant benefits of long-range planning are not reaped.

Similarly, in establishing interinstitutional programs, a member of the central office staff could build on paper a very neatly packaged program that included the minutest details for implementation; and his unilaterally developed proposal could well be judged a better product than would be produced through joint participation. Under these circumstances, however, not only is the extremely important process of developing interpersonal relationships missing, but there is another major flaw in strategy. The institutional personnel who will be involved in or affected by the implementation of a proposed program will not have had a hand in shaping the program. Consequently, they will tend to look upon the program—once it is initiated—as someone else's or as belonging to the central organization. When the personnel who should be involved develop the attitude that an outside program is being imposed upon them, they are unlikely to cooperate with any degree of enthusiasm. In addition, the benefits achieved from cooperative planning during the program's development facilitate the launching of a program.

One should not conclude that central office staff are to abdicate the role of leadership in program development. On the contrary, their role should be second to none. But their skill in playing the "right" role demands competence and sensitivity of the highest order. They must be able to maintain the respect of the institutional faculty and staff while structuring and guiding meetings conducive to the growth of good campus relationships. All the details of preparation for such events deserve the attention of the central office staff, and when there is a confrontation among institutional personnel, the staff should be able to suggest compromises and alternatives. Their role is many-faceted and their ability to meet the unexpected and to maintain a sense of direction in the face of conflict will often make the difference between the consortium's success or failure.

Can "voluntarism" succeed?

The fact that voluntary interinstitutional cooperation is a significant, rapidly growing phenomenon in higher education today is generally accepted. The specific experience of existing cooperative arrangements is, however, less commonly known, and the important factors influencing the success or failure of consortiums have not been sufficiently explored. Improved reporting and general communication, in-depth and comprehensive studies and evaluation, cost analyses of benefits achieved for resources invested, and long-range planning are some of the aspects which merit considerably more attention than they have received to date. Until these important matters are more vigorously and systematically treated, the painful and sometimes fatal, expensive and wasteful trial-and-error method will continue to serve as the primary source of knowledge. If voluntary cooperation is to have a fair opportunity to demonstrate that it merits a place in the sun, the responsibility for its growth cannot be shouldered wholly by consortia personnel and organizations.

How may the small group of consortia alert the entire higher education community and indeed society at large to the tremendous stakes involved in the survival and viability of the voluntary cooperative movement? Calling attention to the principles of freedom of choice, individualism, and "voluntarism" is not empty rhetoric but is directly related to certain conditions developing in higher education. Public institutions will survive in one form or another and interinstitutional cooperation among them will occur by mandate of law if it is not undertaken voluntarily. The success of voluntarism, at this moment, depends upon private institutions, and their commitment to the preservation of that option is of fundamental importance to the welfare of all higher education. The voluntary approach, it should be remembered, offers a bridge between public and private education leaving the structure of each intact.

If voluntary consortiumism survives, what should the future role of such consortia be? The purposes of consortia discussed earlier indicate that consortia have a special role in higher education. To serve effectively, consortia must constantly guard against becoming too bureaucratic. Institutionalization may offer temporary stability and security, but it diminishes flexibility and creativity—a consortium's greatest strengths. As agents of change, consortia personnel will find their task both formidable and hazardous.

To whom may consortia personnel turn for assistance? Unfortunately, the most resourceful universities lack expertise in the art of voluntary consorting. And it is unlikely that more than fragmentary answers will come from the non-academic world. Consortia personnel must turn to their own resourcefulness for professionalization of their trade. In 1968, I conducted a questionnaire survey asking respondents to list five inter-consortium concerns. The responses from 34 directors of consortia indicated: endorsement of *The Acquainter*, or a similar newsletter, as an instrument for consortia communications; approval of the national semi-annual seminars of consortia personnel; and mixed feelings regarding the need for a National Center for Consortia.

The question of how consortia should interrelate is still open. Currently, there is an informal communications system among individuals representing consortia. Should a national organization be established in the future, it is likely to be based on individual rather than organizational membership. The present central concern of consortia collectively should be to enhance the consorting art in whatever ways possible and to remain free of issues that might divide and splinter the immature but developing profession. Voluntary consorting has made significant and rapid advances in the past decade, but its permanence in the educational community is far from certain. For each of the existing consortia, there are at least 20 others on paper. And, for even the strongest, the period of incubation is unknown.

APPENDIX A. Members of Consortia
Listed in *Directory of Academic Cooperative Arrangements in Higher Education* (1970).

1. Alabama Center for Higher Education
2. The Alabama Consortium for the Development of Higher Education
3. Associated Colleges of Central Kansas
4. Associated Colleges of the Mid-Hudson Area
5. Associated Colleges of the Midwest
6. The Associated Colleges of the St. Lawrence Valley
7. Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges
8. Atlanta University Center Corporation
9. Attrition Reduction Consortium
10. The Bates, Bowdoin and Colby Consortium
11. Central Pennsylvania Consortium
12. Central States College Association
13. The Chicago Consortium of Colleges and Universities
14. The Claremont Colleges
15. Cleveland Commission on Higher Education
16. College Center of the Finger Lakes
17. Colleges of Mid-America, Inc.
18. Committee on Institutional Cooperation
19. The Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario
20. Conference of Rectors and Principals of Quebec Universities
21. Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area
22. Cooperating Raleigh Colleges
23. Council of Higher Educational Institutions in New York City
24. Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium
25. The Dubuque Colleges
26. Erie Consortium of Colleges
27. Five Colleges, Incorporated
28. Great Lakes Colleges Association
29. The Greater Los Angeles Consortium
30. Greensboro Tri-College Consortium
31. GT/70 (Group Ten Community Colleges for the Seventies)
32. Higher Education Center for Urban Studies
33. Higher Education Coordinating Council of Metropolitan St. Louis
34. The Hudson-Mohawk Association of Colleges & Universities
35. Inter-University Council of the North Texas Area
36. Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education
37. The Kentuckiana Metroversity, Inc.
38. Lehigh Valley Association of Independent Colleges, Inc.
39. Mid-Appalachia College Council, Inc.
40. Mid-Missouri Associated Colleges
41. Mississippi Association of Developing Colleges
42. Mountain State Association of Colleges
43. National Council of Associations for International Studies
44. New Hampshire College and University Council
45. Northern Plains Consortium
46. Northwest Association of Private Colleges and Universities
47. Piedmont University Center of North Carolina, Inc.
48. Regional Council for International Education
49. The San Francisco Consortium
50. Six Institutions' Consortium
51. South Carolina Foundation of Independent Colleges, Inc.

52. Southwest Alliance for Latin America
53. Texas Association of Developing Colleges
54. The Association for Graduate Education and Research of North Texas (TAGER)
55. Triangle Association of Colleges
56. Union of Independent Colleges of Art
57. Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities
58. University Center in Georgia
59. University Center at Harrisburg
60. University Center in Virginia
61. Worcester Consortium for Higher Education, Inc.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A review of the literature on higher education and particularly of that on interinstitutional cooperation shows that little was written on cooperative arrangements before 1959. Research of the author and three other thesis writers indicates, in fact, that two-thirds of the writing on interinstitutional cooperation appeared after 1963. Various indexes to higher education literature have yet to adopt the term "consortium," although "interinstitutional cooperation" began to appear with some frequency in the last four years. To assure extensive coverage of sources, researchers will find it necessary to search under a variety of terms.

Many of the 52 documents selected for annotation are cited in the text. Nine other references cited in the text are listed without annotation. Among these nine are three recommended newsletters: *The Acquainter*, edited by Lewis D. Patterson; *Developing Junior Colleges*, edited by Selden Menefee; and *Regional Spotlight*, edited by Mary Kay Murphy. In addition, four unpublished PhD theses are listed without annotations because their titles are self-explanatory and their topics are highly specialized (Feil, 1968; Livingston, 1968; Morton, 1963; Sullivan, 1967).

The annotated documents were selected on the basis of: (1) availability through library systems or the publisher; (2) comprehensiveness or special interest; and (3) reputation of author or frequent citation in the literature. Over one-third are surveys and studies of various kinds. In the last two years, interinstitutional cooperation has become an attractive subject of dissertations; and there are at least ten such studies as well as an equal number of non-thesis studies under way. They are not listed here because the date of completion is uncertain.

Many mimeographed unpublished papers, newsletters, annual reports, brochures and pamphlets were also omitted because of their limited availability when not current. It should be noted, however, that when these publications are current, they contain a wealth of valuable specific information and can generally be obtained on order. Readers wishing to request such items from the 61 consortia listed in the *Directory of Academic Cooperative Arrangements in Higher Education* (Patterson, 1967-70) will find names and addresses there.

Acres, Henry A. "The Executive Role in Consortium Leadership." In *Papers of the Academic Consortia Seminar on the Executives' Role in Consortium Leadership*, edited by Lewis D. Patterson. Kansas City, Mo.: Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, 1969 (Mimeographed).

This paper presents an unusually forthright statement of the consortium director's role. Acres noted, "... just as there are varieties of consortia, so are there variations of leadership. Hardly conscious of our shift of gears, we go from serving, to directing, to executing. There is a time to serve, a time to direct, and a time to execute. The trick is doing the right thing at the right time." Specific examples are cited to illustrate the various responsibilities of the consortium director, including the recognition of failure.

Anderson, Wayne W. *Cooperation Within American Higher Education.* Washington: Association of American Colleges, 1964.

The opening sentence of this study states that, "Although there may be as many cooperative arrangements in American higher education as there are Americans, this report will attempt to isolate various examples ...." Anderson proceeds to list 83 cooperative arrangements of the following types: bilateral, city and area, state, regional and national. The data on each organization include the

director's name, office address and a 3-4 paragraph synopsis of programs. Although the document should have been invaluable to practioners in the field when current, it is now less relevant. An updated document of a similar type would be very useful.

Anzalone, Joseph Samuel. *An Interinstitutional Admissions Program for the State University System of Florida.* Tallahassee, Fla.: State University System of Florida, Office of the Board of Regents, 1967.

The objective of this 189-page published dissertation was to design a recommended program for a coordinated, system-wide admissions effort that recognizes the uniqueness of the state's several public universities. The study reviews the admissions crisis at the national level, annotates pertinent literature, reports a survey of cooperative admissions programs in the United States, notes changing patterns of admissions policies in Florida, and proposes a coordinated admissions program for the State University System.

Anzalone's recommendations include: (1) standardization of the admissions timetable, (2) a uniform application form, (3) a uniform admissions process, (4) a common recommendation form, (5) a uniform data form from secondary schools, (6) a common entrance examination, (7) a uniform early decision timetable, (8) simultaneous announcement of acceptance of freshmen by the two largest universities, (9) a uniform candidate reply date, (10) careful consideration of the application referral process, (11) an established procedure for systematic identification of multiple applications, and (12) an interinstitutional admissions research program. Voluntary consortia and state systems considering a Single Application Method (SAM) and other uniform admissions processes would benefit from this study. One consortium having an operational SAM program is The Associated Colleges of the Midwest.

Armstrong, Jack L. *An Interim Term Digest.* St. Paul, Minn.: Macalester College, 1969. ED 040 667. MF-$0.25, HC-$1.45.

This 27-page inventory of American institutions with a 4-1-4 plan was undertaken in the belief that the inter-term offers an opportunity for colleges to begin interinstitutional cooperation with an uncomplicated program and on a short-term basis. The *Digest* lists institutions considering an interim term or having (1) a January interim term (2) a voluntary program, (3) a single theme program, (4) different themes for each class, (5) special programs for freshmen and varied programs for others, (6) primary emphasis on independent study, or (7) a combination course-independent study. Miscellaneous listings include: (1) junior colleges with an interim term, (2) colleges with a 4-1-4 or similar patterns, (3) colleges with a pre-Christmas interim term, (4) colleges discontinuing or rejecting the interim term plan, and (5) a selected bibliography. "Inter-institutional Cooperation Through a 4-1-4 Calendar," by Armstrong in *The Acquainter*, February 1970, explains the author's rationale on inter-term cooperation for student and faculty exchange.

Bennis, Warren G. "New Patterns of Leadership for Tomorrow's Organization." *Technology Review 70*, April 1968, pp. 36-42.

This work deals generally with organization and administration, but goes immediately to the crux of educational problems and is especially applicable to consortia philosophy. Bennis forecasts that bureaucracy–a pyramided, centralized, functionally specialized, impersonal mechanism–will end in the next 25-50 years because the system is out of joint with contemporary realities. In its place will be adaptive, problem-solving, temporary systems of diverse specialists, linked together by coordinating executives. A major leadership qualification will be interpersonal competence comparable to substantive competence. Other necessary qualifications will be: knowledge of large complex systems and their dynamics, knowledge of practical theories of intervening and guiding these systems and integrating individuals and groups, and an ability to use all types of information systems.

Collaborative leadership must be developed. No one man can comprehend or control the complex modern organization. Executive constellation means not an abandonment of executive leadership responsibility but an enlargement of executive effectiveness through realistic allocation of responsibility. A related problem is to build a collaborative climate within the organization; this involves a flexible structure, norms of openness, trust, and cooperation, interdependence, and group participation in the decision-making process.

Consortia personnel who are collaborating with institutional personnel on building new structures would do well to arm themselves with copies of Bennis's article.

Berdahl, Robert O. "Status Report of Statewide Coordinating Agencies." Paper presented at the 25th National Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, Ill., March 1-4, 1970.

Berdahl's paper, drawn from an ACE study, notes: (1) the prevalence of the three methods of statewide coordination identified by Chambers; (2) that the trend toward voluntary coordination of public higher education reached its peak in the 50s but is now markedly declining; and (3) that the number of states with formal coordination increased from 15 in 1939 to 48 in 1969. The author indicates that approximately one-third of the coordinating boards include representation from private higher education. If the trend among public higher education institutions is any indication of what might be in store for private education, one might surmise that time is probably running short for private education to determine whether a move to greater coordination can be undertaken voluntarily.

Burn, North. "Managing the Consortium as an Instrument of Change." In *Papers of the Academic Consortia Seminar on the Executives' Role in Consortium Leadership,* edited by Lewis D. Patterson. Kansas City, Mo.: Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, 1969 (Mimeographed).

Burn speaks to a major role of consortia directors–that of being a change agent. He discusses: (1) managing the consortium so that it is not an obstacle to change, (2) managing the consortium so as to facilitate institutional change, and (3) using the consortium to bring about change. Examples of each are given to illustrate not only the difficulty of effecting change but of deciding if and what change is wise.

Burnett, Howard J., ed. *Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education.* Proceedings of the Conference on Interinstitutional Cooperation, Corning, New York, April 29-30, 1960. Corning, N.Y.: College Center of the Finger Lakes, 1970.

These papers recap the history of the American consortium movement and highlight the leadership role of New York. (The State Education Department, co-sponsor of the Conference, actively continues to encourage area cooperation and has sought, unsuccessfully to date, to acquire annual funding of $1 million to assist cooperative arrangements within the state.) The 126-page paperback offers current perspectives on cooperation from a variety of viewpoints: directors from several types of consortia, institutional presidents, a faculty member, and a student. In addition to the earlier mentioned guidelines for developing a consortium, three of the presentations focus on financing, an aspect of consorting that is not well understood. Appendix A, "Directory," provides a brief overview of 47 operational consortia.

Chambers, M. M. *Voluntary Statewide Coordination in Public Higher Education.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1961. HE 000 668.

This paperback was written because of the author's concern for wasteful duplication in public higher education at the state level. Though it is only 83 pages in length, Chambers masterfully explores his topic. A review of methods of seeking coordination is followed by reports of accomplishments in California, Colorado, Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan. Three methods of state-wide coordination are identified: voluntary, compulsory, and consolidation of operating control.

Clary, William W. *The Claremont Colleges: A History of the Development of The Claremont Group Plan.* Pasadena, Calif.: The Castel Press, 1970.

The classic to date on interinstitutional cooperation, this superb book is a must for any creditable library on higher education. The author's association with higher education in Claremont dates to 1909 when he enrolled as a student at Pomona College. In a well documented but highly readable style, Clary describes the development of the Claremont Colleges over a 47-year span. As the oldest existing consortium in the United States, the Claremont Colleges have a unique setting, history, and purposes. This account of its history is recommended especially for readers interested in securing a long-range view, acquiring a perspective on consortium leadership vs. institutional resistance, grasping an appreciation of the potential of cooperative fund raising, and gaining an insight into internal tensions.

Clay, Grady C. "College Consortia." *The Courier-Journal and Times Magazine,* December 8, 1968, pp. 8-17.

The significance of this 10-page article lies partially in the fact that it is authorized by a non-educator and written clearly for the layman. Clay did his homework well in visiting 15 consortia across the nation and arming himself with numerous facts and figures on cooperative arrangements. His motive was to promote a "Kentuckiana Metroversity" consortium of eight institutions in the Louisville area. A cooperative organization was formally established in early 1969, but it appears to have progressed little to date beyond the paper stage.

Clothier, Grant, and Swick, James. *Cooperation: A Key to Urban Teacher Education.* Monograph, Volume 1, Number 2. Kansas City, Mo.: Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory, 1969.

This 39-page monograph deals primarily with the development and operation of an inner-city teacher education program administered by school systems, colleges, universities, and other agencies. The Cooperative Urban Teacher Education (CUTE) program, initiated in 1966 in Kansas City, provides an opportunity for education students from 19 participating colleges and universities to fulfill their student-teaching requirement in inner-city schools. CUTE does not stop with the classroom but affords a total living, studying, teaching experience with disadvantaged people for a full school term. The program, which requires specialized staff in addition to the cooperation of participating school districts, has been so successful in attracting young persons to take permanent teaching positions in schools located in disadvantaged areas that it was adopted by Wichita and Oklahoma City in 1968. Consortia considering inner-city teacher education programs will find the monograph of great value.

Collective Autonomy: Second Annual Review, Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario, 1968.

This review reports on the development of a Canadian consortium. The Foreword by Sir Eric Ashby provides a philosophical glimpse of the thinking of some educators in Canada and Britain in regard to interdependence of institutions of higher education.

> This is the only way in which the universities of Britain can continue to depend on Government funds and yet be strong enough to secure, by collective bargaining, the conditions necessary to fulfill their function in society.

"Cooperation Among Institutions: Achievements and Expectations." Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges. *Liberal Education* 54, March 1968, pp. 5-87.

The articles deal with: Interinstitutional Cooperation in International Studies, Forms of Cooperation, Cooperation in the Natural Sciences, Cooperation–A Mixed Blessing, Cooperation in Library Services, Operational Problems that Arise between Cooperating Institutions, and New Collegiate Options through Joint Action. The authors, who are nationally recognized, provide a succinct and relatively up-to-date report on the consortium movement.

Cuadra, Carlos. "A Study of the Library Components in Consortia in American Higher Education." Proposal for Submission to the U.S. Office of Education for Support through Authorization of the Office of Program Planning and Evaluation. Santa Monica, Calif.: System Development Corporation, January 20, 1970.

Two products are intended to result from this study, which involves surveying and identifying all library components in higher education consortia.

1. A Directory of Library Consortia enumerating their services, and summarizing statistical data. One or more indexes will be developed to provide convenient access points for directory users.

2. A step-by-step guide to help libraries plan, develop, operate and evaluate library services cooperatively. The guidelines will be based on the survey and an in-depth analysis of 15 selected library consortia. One or more basic models will be identified and outlined to facilitate the establishment and development of new library networks.

Carlos A. Cuadra, director of the study, stated,

> In contrast to the simple and largely informal arrangements for inter-library loans, consortium or network arrangements call for member libraries to share system planning and development resources, as well as operating responsibilities and function. It is this full-fledged sharing that offers the best way out of the present cost/service dilemma faced by the 24,000 libraries in this country.

Devlin, J. Stuart, "Guiding Constituents From Cooperation to Interdependence." Proceedings of the Conference, Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, Corning, New York, April 29-30, 1969. In *Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education,* edited by Howard J. Burnett. Corning, N.Y.: College Center of the Finger Lakes, 1970.

Devlin considers the role of consortium leadership in relation to two major obstacles to cooperation: institutional insecurity and lack of commitment. Devlin suggests that consortia directors consult one another and that they consider their role as basically a staff function of facilitating. Salesmanship is stressed as important. The conclusion is that really significant kinds of cooperation can take place only when there is interdependence since institutional resources are limited.

Donovan, George F., ed. *College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation.* Proceedings of the Workshop on College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, Catholic University of America, June 11-22, 1964. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1965.

Varying patterns of voluntary cooperation that were examined by the 37 conference participants included: small colleges, library services, religious focus, undergraduate level, and state and regional levels. This 158-page report covering many topics has the advantage of providing detail but the disadvantage of having no overall conclusions and recommendations.

Education Directory, 1968-69, Part 3, Higher Education. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968.

Cited in text.

Ertell, Merton W. *Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education.* Albany, N.Y.: University of the State of New York, 1957.

Ertell's study referring to experiences in New York is a historically significant document because of its comprehensive treatment of the state of the are. The study revealed that over four-fifths of the state's then-existing 157 colleges and universities were engaged in cooperative relationships. It includes sections on pilot projects, cooperation in and outside New York, and philosophy of cooperation. Ertell expresses "reserved" optimism on voluntary cooperation and places a premium on experimenting with varying approaches. His brief recommendations for future development are general and fairly conservative.

Feil, Larry. "An Analysis and Evaluation of the Cooperative Music Program in the Associated Colleges of Central Kansas with Recommendations for Improvement." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1968.

Five College Cooperation: Directions for the Future. Report of the Five College Long Range Planning Committee. Amherst, Mass.: Five Colleges, Inc., 1969. Ed 034 491; Not available from EDRS.

This report is the product of meetings held for slightly over a year of the consortium coordinator and three institutional

representatives from each of the five member institutions: Amherst, Hampshire, Mt. Holyoke and Smith Colleges and the University of Massachusetts. The chapters cover: Academic Complementarity, Academic Programs, Student Course Exchange, The Four-One-Four Calendar, Supplementary Academic Activities, Coeducation, Planning and Use of Facilities and Services, Community Relations and Public Service, Governance, and Economic Consequences of Cooperation. Each section concludes with several recommendations and the report itself concludes with priorities and a summary of recommendations. Generally, the Committee neither suggested a return to separatism nor complete merger, but favored a continuation of activities basically as they now are carried on. They questioned the wisdom of detailed long-range planning for consortium development for it has the potential of "locking in" what may need to be left open. The future direction of Five Colleges will be a case-in-point for observation.

The Formation of Intercollegiate Cooperative Centers. A Report prepared for the Office of Administrative Services in Higher Education, New York State Education Department. Corning, N.Y.: College Center of the Finger Lakes, 1969.

This 64-page report offers procedural guidelines for the formation of intercollegiate "centers." The guidelines were developed because the New York State Education Department accepted some responsibility for a leadership role in promoting new consortia in New York. Fritz Grupe, Study Director of the well established College Center of the Finger Lakes, studied problems encountered by college administrators in establishing cooperative centers over a period of several months. The guidelines were the product of three developmental stages: a review of the literature, application to centers in different stages of development, and a review by 48 directors of established consortia. The guidelines, outlined in 15 steps, are presented in three phases: Exploratory, Planning, and Implementation. In terms of practical assistance to persons considering the forming of a consortium, there probably is no better single resource. However, because of the diversity of American institutions of higher education and conditions in any particular potential cooperative arrangement, no single model for development is likely to be applicable without considerable modification.

Gaff, Jerry G., and Associates. *The Cluster College.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

The Cluster College describes and analyses the concept of a small college on a larger university campus. Gaff, undertook the writing with four convictions: (1) American institutions need major reshaping; (2) efforts are under way to perform the required reconstruction; (3) many serious problems emanate from structural matters; and (4) ideas have consequences. The authors advocate utility of the cluster college concept to restructure undergraduate education. They analyze the application of various cluster college approaches to achieving innovations in curriculum, grading, instruction, governance, and residence requirements.

Glenny, Lyman A. *Autonomy of Public Colleges: The Challenge of Coordination.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1959.

This book confronts the most sensitive issue and greatest single obstacle regarding the development of viable interinstitutional cooperation–institutional autonomy. When it was written over a decade ago, there was little question that private institutions, immune to "public domain," could determine independently their own destiny. Thus its theme was coordination of public education at the state level, but its applicability to public and private consorting today is remarkable. Questions are raised concerning "diversity":

> Many university presidents, where neither formal nor voluntary coordinating agencies exist, oppose their establishment on the ground that coordination is almost certain to lead to the stifling of initiative, excessive standardization, and educational mediocrity .... [But] the diversity that now exists has not been systematically devised, but is largely unplanned and fortuitous .... yet, if we are to provide for the maximum development of individual potentialities at all levels ... there will have to be more systematic and effective differentation of educational programs.

A major portion of *Autonomy* is devoted to "evaluation" of coordinating agencies. A few of Glenny's "Conclusions," selected for their current relevance are abbreviated here (1) The greatest problem of coordination is how to achieve common objectives without destroying institutional iniative, flexibility, and diversity. (2) Voluntary coordinating agencies allow a maximum of institutional freedom. (3) Coordinating agencies are deficient in overall and long-range planning. (4) Reports that central agencies standardize in negative ways are greatly exaggerated. (5) Disagreement and inaction on the part of institutions have encouraged state agencies to fill the leadership vacuum.

Grupe, Fritz H. "Guidelines for Organization." Proceedings of the Conference, Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, Corning, New York, April 29-30, 1969. In *Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education*, edited by Howard J. Burnett. Corning, N.Y.: College Center of the Finger Lakes, 1970.

The interested reader with limited reading time is referred to this nine-page paper. It is a condensed report of the study directed by Grupe and is one of the most significant contributions that has been made to the literature on consortia.

Grupe, Fritz H. "The Establishment of Collegiate Cooperative Centers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York, Albany, 1969.

A more detailed report, particularly in regard to background data, is presented here.

Johnson, Eldon L. "Consortia in Higher Education." *Educational Record,* 48, Fall, 1967, pp. 341-7.

Johnson states that cooperation,

> . . . is the current compensatory reaction to our long history of overproliferation of autonomous colleges and universities. Having spawned both number and variety to dwarf every other country by comparison we are not likely suddenly to stop, but we are rapidly introducing an important offsetting element. We are building connecting links, associations, councils, partnerships, clusters, consortia, committees, centers, confederations, and federations. It is significant that no single appropriate name has been found to fit the variety–all kinds of lateral bonds which were unthinkable in earlier years of religious and secular drives for fiercely independent colleges and universities. Indeed, we have entered a reverse historical phase which seems to embrace interinstitutional coordination and cooperation as a necessary step for completeness–sometimes more to profess than to perform, but still, somehow, the logical thing to do.

The trend toward formalization, potentialities, limitations, and effectiveness are also examined.

Lancaster, Richard B. "Interdependency and Conflict in a Consortium for Cooperation in Higher Education: Toward a Theory of Interorganizational Behavior." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969.

The researcher's documentation and analysis of operational dynamics make this dissertation dealing with one of the nation's largest and more developed consortia the best case study of a consortium undertaken to date. Its potential contribution to sophistication in the development of a complex consortium is almost unlimited. Lancaster's research revealed, contrary to higher education literature, "that the consortium [studied] was not organized in response to recognized interdependency, but was formed primarily to *create* interdependency." Further, it was found that, "Conflict was *not* conceived as dysfunctional but as defining boundaries and generating search behavior." An excellent balance is achieved between theoretical considerations, which lends to the value of the research on consortia in general, and actual, specific problems and programs. The reader with limited time is referred to an eight-page paper by Lancaster, "Conflict in Interinstitutional Cooperation" in *Papers of Two Academic Consortia Seminars,* edited by L. Patterson (Kansas City, Mo.: Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, 1970. ED 039 839. MF-$0.25, HC-$0.50).

Livingston, James Arthur. "Unification and Fragmentation Among Educators' Organizations: An Interorganizational Analysis." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1968.

Markus, Frank W., ed. *Partners for Educational Progress: An Analysis of Cooperation.* Kansas City, Mo.: University of Missouri-Kansas City, 1967.

This 67-page monograph is addressed basically but not exclusively to elementary-secondary educational cooperation within a metropolitan area. School districts, with the exception of Cleveland notably and a limited number of other areas, generally perpetuate autonomy with a vigor comparable to or greater than that of institutions of higher education. Thus, the major portion of consolidation and coordination in K-12 education has been forced or "induced" through legislated devices at the state level. The monograph is cited in this bibliography because: (1) the needs, problems, and principles of K-12 cooperation are not unlike those for higher education, and (2) the author of this paper believes that horizontal cooperation among institutions of higher education in a given region will be prevented from moving beyond a certain point of development when there is an absence of horizontal cooperation at the K-12 level. The author suggests that consortia desirous of cooperation with K-12 education seriously consider teacher education as an appropriate entry point. The monograph aims to (1) describe the complexities of change–its effect upon man, organizations, and society–and the increasing need for cooperation; (2) synthesize and develop general principles of cooperation; (3) provide examples of cooperation among organizations; and (4) construct two specific proposals for action which apply principles of cooperation.

Martorana, S.V., James C. Messersmith, and Lawrence O. Nelson, eds. *Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities.* U.S.O.E., Circular No. 649. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961.

With the publication of this study, the US Office of Education clearly goes on the record as supportive of increased interinstitutional cooperation.

> Improved mechanisms for cooperation among higher education institutions, and between these institutions and other agencies which contribute to and draw upon their resources, can greatly assist in the difficult process of relating individual efforts to the needs of the Nation.

Half of the 45-page circular identifies and describes 29 cooperative projects in higher education operative at local, state, and regional levels: Chapters also include: Planning for Cooperation, Helps and Hindrances, and Principles and Guidelines for Establishing Interinstitutional Programs.

Mayhew, Lewis B. "A Proposal for Cooperation Among National Organizations in Higher Education." Paper presented to the 24th National Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, Illinois, March 4, 1969. ED 028 716. MF-$0.25, HC-$0.35.

Mayhew's "Proposal" calls for a consortium of major national education organizations to minimize confusion regarding their purposes and to prevent needless duplication and overlapping of efforts. Mayhew lists seven major purposes, three means of finance, and nine beginning responsibilities. The proposed council in effect would be a voluntary consortium of consortia with the memberships drawn from national organizations. The paper should be of prime interest to consortia directors who are developing informal relationships with several national organizations. Representatives from eight national organizations spoke to participants in the March 1970 Academic Consortia

Seminar in Chicago (see "Report on Exploratory Study" by J. Stuart Devlin in *Papers of Two Academic Consortia Seminars,* edited by Lewis D. Patterson. Kansas City, Mo.: Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, 1970).

McCoy, Pressley C. "The Forms of Interinstitutional Cooperation." *Liberal Education* 54, March 1968, pp. 30-40.

Cited in text.

Menefee, Selden, ed. *Developing Junior Colleges: A Newsletter Published by the AAJC Program with Developing Institutions.* Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges.

Cited in text.

Moore, Raymond S. *Consortiums in American Higher Education 1965-66,* Washington: US Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1968. HE 000 160.

Moore's study is useful in being succinct, largely narrational, and interpretative, but it lumps together all types of cooperative arrangements and agreements as "consortia." The contents include: Recent History and Rationale of the Consortium Movement, Facts and Figures on 1017 Consortiums, Interrelationship of (selected) Variables, Evaluation of Existing and Discontinued Consortiums, and Recommendations for Future Studies. Highlights of the Moore report include:

1. Consortium is defined as an arrangement whereby two or more institutions, at least one of which is an institution of higher education, agree to a program.
2. The consortium movement dates back to the 1920s.
3. The largest portion of the 1017 existing consortia studied entailed graduate level cooperation.
4. Approximately one-fifth of the existing consortia received federal support, two-fifths of 203 planned consortia anticipate federal support.
5. Of 708 institutions evaluating their consortia, 52% reported the effort was worthwhile and 42% reported the effort was very worthwhile.

Moore, Raymond S. *A Guide to Higher Education Consortiums: 1965-66.* Washington: US Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1967.

The data for this tabular report of all types of cooperative agreements and arrangements in American higher education were acquired through a questionnaire mailed to 1577 institutions and from other information in the files of the Agency. They are reported in two tables: (1) an alphabetical listing of institutions under study by state indicating four institutional characteristics, six graduate-undergraduate factors, and 17 desired areas of institutional participation; (2) names of Consortia, listed by code number assigned in Table 1, with location, control and type, student enrollment, years of institutional membership, 17 areas of institutional participation, and 19 organizational characteristics.

The value of the *Guide,* even when current, has been questioned by a number of directors of consortia because of its inclusion of organizations and agreements not universally accepted as consortia, and reporting of data of little or no practical use. Perhaps the study should be credited with disclosing that there is a web of much more extensive institutional linkages than may have been previously realized. Too, portions of the data may be useful to future research in interinstitutional cooperation.

Morgan, Andrew W. "A College President's Assessment of the Consortium Movement." In *Papers of the Academic Consortia Seminar on Assessing the Consortium Movement,* edited by Lewis D. Patterson. Kansas City, Mo.: Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, 1968 (Mimeographed).

A candid assessment of consortiumism, this address examines the nitty gritty: (1) Why in the world should talented educators consider being consortia administrators? (2) Must foundations "buy" consortia as successful before investing any money? (3) Success of the collective does not guarantee prosperity for its individual parts. (4) Conversely, any success enjoyed by consortia must be measured in terms of impact on the individual college and its immediate constituency. (5) Programs can be developed on paper that look great but won't work. (6) An individual college may eventually belong to a spectrum of consortia. (7) A consortium is designed to serve a regenerative purpose, not replace a group of institutions. (8) We're just beginning to learn to work together. (9) Institutions cannot allow the consortium director to do all of the consortium work. (10) The consortium director is not going to judge the success of the consortium, the presidents will.

Morton, Benjamin L. "State and Regional Cooperative Fund Raising Associations of Private Colleges and Universities." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1963.

Murphy, Mary Kay, ed. *Regional Spotlight: News of Higher Education in the South.* Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board.

Cited in text.

Patterson, Lewis D., ed. *Academic Consortia Seminar Papers: Summaries and Presentations of National Academic Consortia Seminars.* Kansas City, Mo.: Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, 1967-70 (Mimeographed).

Cited in text.

Patterson, Lewis D., ed. *The Acquainter: An International Newsletter for Academic Consortia.* Kansas City, Mo.: Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education.

Cited in text.

Patterson, Lewis D. *Comparative Study of Academic Consortia.* Kansas City, Mo.: Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, 1968 (Mimeographed).

Cited in text.

Patterson, Lewis D., ed. *Directory of Academic Cooperative Arrangements in Higher Education.* Kansas City, Mo.: Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, 1967-70.

Cited in text.

Patterson, Lewis D. *Report on an Opinion Poll of Academic Consortia Directors.* Kansas City, Mo.: Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, 1968 (Mimeographed).

Cited in text.

Rabineau, Louis. "History Making Legislation for Consortia in Connecticut." *The Acquainter* 2, August 1969, pp. 1-2.

This article reports on legislation passed in Connecticut in 1969 which,

> . . . authorizes the Commission for Higher Education to establish Higher Education Centers involving two or more public or private boards of trustees to plan, develop and administer higher education *facilities* as well as educational programs.

Rabineau noted salient features of the bill: (1) a "Center" is defined as a facility used by two or more institutions; (2) centers are established by the Commission; and (3) boards of trustees of constituent units are collectively responsible for Center operations. Following enactment, $6,250,000 was appropriated for the first phase of the first consortium in Waterbury. With the active leadership and brick-and-mortar support of the state, Connecticut may become a pace setter for the nation in genuinely interlinking its institutions of higher education via consortium arrangements.

Rhinesmith, W. Donald. "Comments on Program Planning, Development and Implementation." In *Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education*, edited by Howard J. Burnett. Corning, N.Y.: College Center of the Finger Lakes, 1970.

This paper recalls the founding in 1946 and subsequent development of the University Center in Virginia, one of the oldest consortia. Project and program committees of institutional academicians have played very active and important roles in the control and administration of cooperative programs. Rhinesmith concludes that the problem the Center now faces is not want of programs, but the updating of organizational structure to make new and bold programs feasible.

Sagan, Edgar L. "A Network Model of Steps for the Implementation of the Planning and Establishing of Higher Education Consortiums." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1969.

Sagan, Edgar L. "An Analysis of the Processes of Developing a Consortium." In *Papers of Two Academic Consortia Seminars,* edited by Lewis D. Patterson. Kansas City, Mo.: Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, 1970 (Mimeographed). ED 033 654. MF-$0.25, HC-$0.95.

This study sought to provide some basic systematized guidelines to assist planners of consortia. Though the stated ends of Sagan and Grupe were similar, their respective supervisory committees agreed their approaches and final model illustrations were different enough to warrant continuation of both studies. Sagan tersely reported the rationale upon which he proceeded in an eight-page paper, "An Analysis of the Processes of Developing a Consortium."

> A survey of the various methodologies of studying organizations and their processes suggested that the *systems* approach would be applicable in this situation. By perceiving organizations as *systems*–that is, a set of variables defined by the relationships that exist among them–the organization is seen as an interrelationship of functions, processes, machines, etc. Rather than seeing only the hierarchial structure, the organization chart, or the official channels of communication, we now study the tasks performed, the jobs done, decision processes, inputs, outputs, and movement toward behavioral objectives.

A theoretical model of 292 steps–encompassing a broad range in level of detail–was developed and graphically illustrated by a 25-foot long PERT Network. Consortia planners should contrast Sagan's work with Grupe's which is based more on actual development experiences.

Salerno, Sister M. Dolores. *Patterns of Interinstitutional Co-operation in American Catholic Higher Education–1964.* Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1966.

The author's scholarly treatment of cooperation among Catholic institutions represents an important contribution to the archives on American higher education. Almost half the document is devoted to reports on 155 cooperative programs operating in 1964 among Catholic institutions. For more detailed examination, Salerno selected a variety of cooperative arrangements, first of the bilateral type and then of the multilateral type. Her final chapter, in addition to a summary, lists findings, conclusions, guidelines for cooperation, and topics recommended for further study. It will be noted that Catholic institutions have established themselves as prime participants in the cooperative movement.

Salwak, Stanley F. "The Need for Cooperation and the CIC Response." *Educational Record* 45, Summer 1964, pp. 308-16.

The founding and early development of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation–the Big Ten universities plus the University of Chicago–is recorded in this article. Salwak asks, "Why did eleven large, and apparently self-sufficient universities embark on such an experiment?" then elaborates upon three priority reasons: (1) to relieve the pressures of competition for scholars and students by pooling their resources, (2) to offer curricula of a highly specialized nature, and (3) to share specialized laboratories, research equipment, library facilities, or field stations. The intent is not to curtail or limit any institution but to make available the combined strength of many. Seed grants, faculty control, and traveling scholars are among other topics reviewed. CIC is generally acknowledged as a consortium in the true sense of the word because the cooperative arrangement is voluntary. CIC may be considered as the closest counterpart among voluntary consortia to the three interstate and statutory compacts: NEHEB, SREB, and WICHE.

Simkin, Faye. *Cooperative Resources Development: A Report on a Shared Acquisitions and Retention System for METRO Libraries.* METRO Miscellaneous Publication No. 5. New York: Metropolitan Reference & Research Library Agency, May 1970.

METRO, the New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency, came into being in 1964 when chartered by the State Board of Regents "to improve reference and research library services in the New York Metropolitan area by promoting and facilitating utilization of existing resources and by developing additional resources." However, it was not until 1969 that METRO embarked on a deliberate plan of cooperative acquisitions and retention. Prospects for area-wide library cooperation, including colleges and university libraries, present exciting possibilities as well as problems because of the massive library resources concentrated in one geographical area. Should New York attain success in this cooperative venture, which will undoubtedly take several years to become fully developed and operational as a unified program, other cities, hopefully, will mount similar efforts. The report attempts to assess the SHARES program during its initial year of development.

Smith, G. Kerry, ed. *In Search of Leaders: Current Issues in Higher Education, 1967.* Washington: Association for Higher Education, 1967.

These papers were selected and edited from among those presented at the 22nd National Conference on Higher Education, March 5-8, 1967, in Chicago. "Effective Models of University Governance," by Algo D. Henderson, probably was written with the governance of single universities in mind, but it is pertinent to the governance of consortia. Henderson identified three models of governance: (1) as a vertical hierarchy of power and authority–in which decision making is done predominantly at the top; (2) as mediation among sub-groups–trustees, administration, faculty, and students; colleges, departments and institutes–each of which needs power to protect and advance respective interests; and (3) through group participation in decision making, which assumes the organization is goal-motivated and requires mutal commitment, compromise, and unity. Henderson's preference is for the third, an alternative equally preferable for consortium governance. Included in the publication are five other papers of consequence to consortia: (1) "Leadership: Organization and Structure," by Martin Tarcher, which stresses the importance of relationships in the use of knowledge; (2) "Interinstitutional Cooperation," by Raymond S. Moore; (3) "Opportunities and Problems for Leadership Through Local and Regional Consortia," by Elmer D. West; (4) "Interinstitutional Cooperation and the Exchange of Instructional Materials," by Ernest L. Boyer; and (5) "Continuing the Information Explosion," by Harold L. Haswell, describing the purpose and services of the ERIC system.

Sullivan, Arthur D. "Patterns of Interinstitutional Cooperation in Canadian Catholic Higher Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1967.

Title III, The Developing Colleges Program of the Higher Education Act of 1965, has provided approximately $30 million per year to assist "developing" colleges in establishing cooperative programs with "assisting" institutions. Developing colleges have been defined by the US Office of Education as isolated from the mainstream of higher education and struggling for survival. Though not limited to any particular types of institutions, predominantly black institutions, especially in the South, were expected to be prime benefactors. The Division of College Support in the Office of Education, responsible for the administration of Title III, has demonstrated an interest in continuing evaluation of supported programs. Reverend William G. Kelly, Administrative Vice President, Loyola University, will be responsible for conducting an OE-sponsored study in 1971. Leaders of cooperative educational enterprises are the first to acknowledge that additional studies, research, evaluation and long-range planning are vitally needed on Title III and all other interinstitutional programs. Though some noble efforts of this sort have been undertaken and are receiving increased attention, funding patterns and other actions provide reason to question whether "findings" are being utilized as guides for future funding decisions by OE and foundations. Three excellent documents on Title III programs are available:

- Howard, Lawrence C. *The Developing Colleges Program: A Study of Title III Higher Education Act of 1965*. Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin, Institute of Human Relations, 1967. ED 023 341. MF-$1.75, HC-$23.65.

This evaluation of two years of the Title III programs for the Office of Education covers: conditions leading up to Title III, the status of Negro colleges, profiles of distinguished institutions, and a systems approach to cooperative program development. Voluminous appendices provide detailed information on Title III programs and on strengths and weaknesses of participating institutions. The narrative section of the document is a classic in providing an important chapter in the history of higher educational developments during the 50s and 60s.

- Howard, Lawrence C., ed. *Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education*. Proceedings of the Conference, Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, Wingspread, Racine, Wisconsin, March 3-4, 1967. Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin, Institute of Human Relations. ED 034 482. MF-$2.25, HC-$28.65.

This 555-page document includes 40 presentations made at the conference, which focused attention on interinstitutional cooperation as a device to support developing institutions with the desired consequence of upgrading higher education as a whole. Because Title III programs were only in their second year of funding at the time, the numerous reports were tentatively judgmental, pinpointed some problems, offered modest recommendations, and raised numerous questions. Even though the focus is Title III, the proceedings are highly recommended for anyone interested in cooperation because of their comprehensiveness, variety of viewpoints, and detailed reporting. Persons interested in a detailed explanation of the Title III legislation are referred to "Achieving Academic Strength Through Interinstitutional Cooperation: The View from the United States Office of Education," by Willa B. Player.

- *Report of the Conference with Developing and Cooperating Institutions of Higher Education*. Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1966.

The conference participants included 60 individuals from institutions of higher education distributed throughout the US and 19 representatives from several federal departments and agencies. The conference, which was convened before the actual appropriation of funds, presents a plan for and prognostication of Title III programs as envisioned by USOE at that time.

Trendler, Carl Alan. "Inter-Institutional Cooperation for Academic Development Among Small Church-Related Liberal Arts Colleges." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1967.

This dissertation examines the nature and rationale for cooperation among private institutions with limited resources. Due to the broadness of the topic, the conclusions were necessarily general and, to some extent, theoretical. However, Trendler's case study of the Central States College Association, a rather widely dispersed consortium, reports on specific services and programs.

Venman, William C. "Summer Sessions and Consortia." *The Acquainter* 1, May 1968, pp. 5-6.

Venman makes a case for developing interinstitutional cooperation around summer sessions. One primary reason would be to enhance the educational opportunities available to students in a given geographical area. Through joint planning of summer sessions, cooperating institutions can avoid conflicts and unnecessary competition. Venman further suggests that consortia might cooperate with each other in the exchange of faculty and students.

Summer sessions, like inter-terms, offer an opportunity for limited, short-duration interinstitutional cooperation. A group of institutions cautiously considering a formal consortium arrangement may be wise in initiating pilot programs in summer sessions and/or inter-terms. Established consortia wishing to explore more extensive cooperation may also look to these areas as convenient entry points.

West, Elmer D. "The Formation of a Consortium." *Proceedings of the Joint Educational-Industrial-Governmental Science Symposium.* Paper presented at Creighton University Symposium on Science Cooperation, Omaha, March 12, 1970.

In this paper, Elmer D. West relates the development of the Consortium of Universities–a metropolitan (Washington, DC) consortium in which the five cooperating universities are in close proximity–while maintaining that each consortium must be unique and that circumstances should determine the structure, purposes, and programs of contemplated consortia. Philosophy, purposes, resources, institutional autonomy, graduate level cooperation, small classes and joint centers, and the relationship of fiscal-academic decisions are discussed.

West, Elmer D. "Operational Problems that Arise Between Cooperating Institutions." *Liberal Education* 54, March 1968, pp. 73-9.

Here, questions are raised regarding organizational structure, fiscal plans, student relationships, faculty and faculty-student relationships, and consortium identity. West discussed the implications of these problem areas but their answers would depend on the particular circumstances within a given consortium.

Wilson, Logan, ed. *Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education.* Washington: American Council on Education, 1965.

This collection includes essays by 34 persons who are instrumental in shaping new policy, organization and administration in higher education. The struggle to reconcile institutional autonomy with demands for new forms of

relationships among colleges and universities is a basic theme. The contents of the document are too extensive for listing here but the titles of the eight parts outline the broad range of considerations examined:

1. The Changing Environment of Higher Education
2. Institutional Modifications
3. The Emergence of State Systems
4. Voluntary Arrangements
5. Interinstitutional and Interstate Agreements
6. Unified Approaches to National Problems
7. National Associations in Higher Education
8. National Policy for Higher Education: Problems and Prospects

If a reader were limited to selecting one document for acquiring a comprehensive perspective of higher education vis-a-vis cooperation, this book should be his choice.

Witman, Shepherd L. *Inter-Institutional Cooperation and International Education,* Occasional Report No. 8. New York, N.Y.: Education and World Affairs, 1969. ED 029 612; Not available from EDRS.

The purpose of the 72-page monograph, is to stimulate discussion of interinstitutional cooperation as a tool for strengthening international education. Specific operational issues and problems are examined: e.g., incentives and deterents, cooperation with other institutions, government, and foundation, faculty and curriculum enrichment, study abroad and overseas centers, intercultural communications, organizing for operation, and financing. Some consortia are organized for the single purpose of international education, but many others include international education as one of their programs.

Witman, director of the Office of Cultural and Educational Exchange, University of Pittsburgh, and president of the Regional Council for International Education (a consortium of consortia) is probably the nation's foremost authority on the cooperative approach to international education.